DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 336 CG 005 674

AUTHOR Cockrum, Logan V.
TITLE Counselors' Invitational Conference on the Family and the Counselor in a Changing World.
SPONS AGENCY Ministry of Education, Bangkok (Thailand).
PUB DATE 27 Apr 68
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Synod held at the campus of St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, North Carolina, April 27, 1968

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes, Conference Reports, Counseling, *Counselor Functions, *Counselor Role, Family Characteristics, Family Life, Family Role, *Family Structure, *Parent Child Relationship, Parent Role

ABSTRACT

This is the report of the proceedings of a conference designed to provide an opportunity for counselors, guidance directors, and others to share ideas and seek a better understanding of what is happening in family life and how this affects the counselor. The conference heard addresses by a sociologist whose major field of study is family life today and by a psychiatrist whose specialization is child psychiatry. Participants in the conference were then involved in small group work to facilitate a comparison of views from different perspectives on the changing family and the counselor's relation to that change. Small group leaders represented various fields and disciplines, including: public school guidance and counseling, technical school and personnel work, counselor education, state guidance services, mental health agencies, psychology, and medicine. Results of small group work were reported in a final panel discussion on "The Family and the Counselor". The major addresses, "The Changing Family in Today's World" and "Parent-Child Relations in Today's World", small group reports and panel discussion are reproduced as presented from tape recordings of the proceedings. (KJ)

ED041336

Counselors' Invitational Conference

On The

Family And The Counselor

In

A Changing World

LOGAN V. COCKRUM
Chairman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Sponsored by

The Presbyterian Guidance Program

Synod Of North Carolina

The Presbyterian Church In The U. S.

Held At St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, North Carolina

April 27, 1968

CG 005 674

ED041336

COUNSELORS' INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE

On The

FAMILY AND THE COUNSELOR

In

A CHANGING WORLD

Logan V. Cockrum

Chairman

Sponsored By
The Presbyterian Guidance Program Committee, Synod of North Carolina
In cooperation with
The Division of Higher Education, Board of Christian Education
The Presbyterian Church in the United States

Held at the Vardell Building
on the campus of St. Andrews Presbyterian College
Laurinburg, North Carolina
April 27, 1968

FOREWORD

This is the report of the proceedings of the Counselors' Invitational Conference on "The Family and the Counselor in a Changing World," held April 27, 1968, on the campus of St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, North Carolina.

The conference was designed to provide an opportunity for counselors, guidance directors, educators and others to come together, share ideas, and seek a better understanding of what is happening in family life today and how this may affect the role and tasks of the counselor in a changing world.

The conference heard addresses by a sociologist whose major field of study is family life today and by a psychiatrist whose specialization is child psychiatry. Participants in the conference were then involved in small group work to facilitate a comparison of views from different perspectives on the changing family and the counselor's relation to that change. Small group leaders represented various fields and disciplines, including: public school guidance and counseling, technical school and personnel work, counselor education, state guidance services, mental health agencies, psychology, and medicine. Results of small group work were reported in a final panel discussion on "The Family and the Counselor."

Headquarters for the conference was the Vardell Building on the campus of St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, North Carolina. Some seventy participants took part. The majority of those participating were public school counselors.

The major addresses, small group reports and panel discussion are reproduced as presented--following the program order--from tape recordings of the proceedings.

The completion of these proceedings was the responsibility of Logan V. Cockrum, Director, Presbyterian Guidance Program, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church in the United States.

PARTICIPANTS

Speakers:

Dr. Ernest L. Stricklin, Secretary
Division of Family Life
Board of Christian Education
Presbyterian Church in the United States

Dr. Don R. Schulte
Clinical Director
The Sandhills Mental Health Center
Pinehurst, North Carolina

Panel Moderator:

Miss Kathryn Ray, State Supervisor
Guidance Services
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Small Group Leaders:

Dr. James E. Mikkelson, Director of Guidance
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Charlotte, North Carolina

Lt./Col. Henry F. Murray (U.S.A.F. Ret.), Director
Piedmont Aerospace Institute
Piedmont Airlines (Assistant to the President)

Dr. Luther R. Taff, Associate Professor
Counselor Education
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Mr. William G. Tucker, Associate Supervisor
Guidance Services
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Mrs. Sara Silverton, Coordinator for Psychological Services
Southeastern Mental Health Center
Lumberton, North Carolina

Dr. Alvin H. Smith, Associate Professor
Division Chairman, Psychology
St. Andrews Presbyterian College

Small Group Reporters:

Dr. Robert H. Pate, Jr., Assistant Professor
Counselor Education
University of Virginia

Dr. Barbara Winn, Physician
Laurinburg, North Carolina

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	i
Participants	ii
The Changing Family in Today's World Dr. Ernest L. Stricklin	1
Parent-Child Relations in Today's World Dr. Don R. Schulte	15
The Family and The Counselor: Comparisons of Views from Different Perspectives Miss Kathryn Ray, Moderator	27
Appendix: Evaluation of Conference	40
Implications Isolated in Small Group Work	41
Ten Implications Isolated	44
Correlation Between Implications and Counselors' Response to Question, "What Kind of Conference Would be Most Helpful to You in Follow Up?"	45
Evaluation Sheet (sample copy)	47

THE CHANGING FAMILY IN TODAY'S WORLD

Dr. Ernest L. Stricklin, Secretary
Division of Family Life
Board of Christian Education
Presbyterian Church, U. S.

I'm glad I'm here for two reasons: number one, I'm glad to have an opportunity to sit with a group of people whom I consider to represent one of the four universes in our culture who can effect change as much as anyone else. The guidance counselor is faced primarily with two issues: to do a lot of patchwork on youth and to help youth adapt to change. In a sense, both of us as family educators and as counselors are up against this. We're confronted much more with trying to keep up--trying to adapt--to what is going on than we are really in the business of trying to effect change. But this is the exact predicament of the family. The family finds itself constantly running with its tongue out. It's getting to the point where they are almost ready to look to anybody who will "promise any solution." Therefore, one day they will pick up a newspaper or magazine and read an article on something. The next day they will read something else that is diametrically opposed, without recognizing the contradiction, because of the pace of life, and the very situation in which they find themselves.

They are, in a sense, propagating a type of fragmentation and a type of confusion simply because they do not have the essential skills or mental health to cope. Their difficulty is multiplied by multimembered households including the peer dimension, the age dimension, and the cultural dimension.

Put these together and you begin to see at least two or three words emerge. One of the words is "confusion." But confusion is not necessarily a negative word. It depends on whether you can find some light. Some people when they are confused seek more than ever before. They're almost as a person about to die: desperately seeking to hold on to life by any means. Other people who are confused simply stand and stare and starve to death, not knowing what they want to do.

Another word that is beginning to emerge is "change," but not so much change, per se, as it is rapid and multi--the pace and dimensions of change.

Some people say that the predictors are always twenty years ahead of the consumer. I think in a lot of the segments of our society that is

true, but many of the predictors of today are themselves members of households whose offsprings are helping, if you please, "to dictate the things they are predicting."

Those, for example, who predict that many American citizens will have two or more spouses in their lifetime are speaking existentially, experientially. They are not out there, if you please, in the avant guard. They are talking to their offspring, many of whom really believe that cohabitation should be norm and marriage should never be a matter to consider. (A case in point is the cohabitation of the two students from Barnard and Columbia which was in the news media in mid April, 1968.)

I was in Boston about two weeks ago and picked up a yellow mimeographed application for different kinds of information on what kind of roommate one wanted. There was a place for sex, age, and various other things. In addition, one had an opportunity to identify the kind of roommate he wanted, age, sex, etc. This is a common practice in the Northeast. It may be a common practice in this state. However, the significant point is that there are many people in the pre-twenty year old group today who are, themselves, really raising a question on whether or not marriage is a significant factor or feature, or a necessary essential in their cohabitation life. Therefore, the predictors who say that many people will cohabit in the future without marriage are not ahead of many of the people who are already propagating the philosophy, even though in some ways the predictors are way ahead of the average consumer.

Therefore, a burden of this presentation this morning will be for you to recognize that there is a gap between some of the things that will be said and where we are in our practice.

As I look at you, I have to make two or three assumptions: one, your intelligence, your information, your knowledge, your insight, your experience are very broad, and I may be quite redundant at times for some of you. But let's hope in the process we will not be that way for all of you throughout this morning. Second, the data I have are not nearly as important per se as the impressions I hope they make on you in the light of your occupation. It's immaterial if you remember a thing I say, or if you think anything I've said is important. But it is significant to me that you look at the data being offered and then see if these say anything to you in your particular situation because that is the primary reason we are here.

Let's look first of all at some general information about the family in America.

The number of families in the United States has remarkedly increased since the Second World War. We now have about 59 million households in the country. This has been an increase in the last decade of about 12 million. Now based on the fact that we live in a culture that did not tend to train people for marriage, we are beginning to see a dimension in our culture that is being accentuated by nothing more than the pace of change and style of life. If we were in a culture that had trained people for marriage and had helped them develop the skills for marriage, we could take the rapid pace much better. And if one is a good churchman or identified with the religious faith, and went to a pastor to arrange for the ceremony, it has been assumed that he has had "marriage counseling." The chances are that the average one of us in this room got married by the skills he already had and our "marriage counseling" contributed very little in a scientific way to us. We live in a highly technological culture, which demands skills to do anything, including how to use and repair a washing machine. The skills to carry out a style of life when our parents were rearing us vary widely from those that are required today. Our problem is compounded by the multi-faced dimension of mass media where patterns of child rearing are contradictory and social scientists are giving us more moral guidelines.

In this country every week 27.3 million pieces of literature are bought by our population dealing with family issues. Somebody is interested. They are seeking something, and we know a part of what is involved if we have even read any of this stuff. Therefore, the rapid increase of many more households coming into our culture compounds the tensions even more.

If you were to compare just on the basis of your own crowded conditions in your school and the workload you have, you would sense a little bit the horrible pressures under which those whom you counsel live. (If you think you have problems now, wait! In the next decade there will be more neurotic "machines" producing more neurotic "offspring" than most of us know what to do with. If we think we are in trouble now, wait until the pre-twenty-five year olds who were reared in almost a totally permissive culture with almost no skills themselves of how to live in a multi-cultural and pluralistic society start having offspring and sending them to public schools.) Therefore, the note that I would like to sound over and over is that the rapid pace of change, without the essential skills and necessary preparation planned, demands an adequate educational response. Family life education in America has historically been a joke to many. "If you want a crip course in college take the sociology of marriage and family." "If you want one that is really sentimental and soupy and want to have some romantic feelings, take one on family life." Well, fortunately the pendulum is beginning to swing a little bit away from that approach, but, unfortunately, not [illegible] enough.

A Health, Education and Welfare director of family life told us last summer that she saw in the next decade the need for parent education would be greater than feeding the poor. I believe she is right. Acquiring and developing skills for parenthood are probably greater in American culture because we no longer accept "identifiable institutions" (such as school, church, etc.) that bring to bear pressures that produce norms. We do not recognize the church or government or community or society in general as institutions which teach skills and establish norms.

Let us look at some of the things that cause marital failure. These tie very, very closely to what you are doing. Perhaps not so much what you are doing as how it affects you and you are affected by it during the so-called formative years of elementary and senior high school. One of these causes of marital failure is immaturity, not in the typical use of the word, but in the sense of not being able to handle conflict. Not just that you have not grown up; but immaturity as I am using it here is the inability to handle conflict, and in some cases bring it to the surface as early and rapidly as possible. Have you got the guts, for example, to talk to your spouse now about the masturbatory problems of your offspring? This illustration is selected partly because it is one that is an issue for all of us, but most of us run away from it.

The second one is personal inadequacy. We used to say that you need at least a high school education to be gainfully employed. I am not sure that a college degree is not about minimum for persons getting married! Now that is facetious--I caricatured in a sense, but the skills that are called for today to live in a man-woman relationship in marriage are so different from what they were in another age. For an individual to survive this, the man-woman relationship demands of him something that he never dreamed of or he does not often have. This causes him to look for a low common denominator to bring the relationship into being. Once it comes into being the denominator is not functional, so he seeks for an out. So, a lot of youth simply respond by saying, "No, we are not going to make that mistake. What we are going to do is to move into the direction of cohabitation. If it just happens to work out that I find that I can relatively live with this person, then I might consider the matter of marriage a little bit later."

Now, mind you, this is a sample of our college population, even though college population is still a minority of our culture. What about the rest of the population?

A third cause is marked differences in background. This would include social, economic, racial, cultural, educational, and ethical.

A fourth is inadequate preparation of life. Here is where the counselor plays a significant role. We have a particular syndrome in

America which asks, "What can I do to make money?" You are faced with this every day, either with your offspring, or those with whom you try to work--"Where can I make the most money." Students of American personality are aware that in our culture that is a democratic, free-enterprise society, one of the ways that neurosis manifests itself is the acquisition of material things. The acquisition of the materials becomes a symbol of that for which they symbolize. A house, for example, out in the suburbs is a symbol for "a home outside of the concrete jungle." A certain kind of uniformity in dress is a symbol for not having to be identified with human beings on a personal level. "If I look like all of them, nobody is going to put too much pressure on me to get involved with them." "If I dress a certain way, the pressure is going to be taken off me to get personally involved." Therefore, I will buy certain styles in order that they will be the symbol for my relationship with others.

A fifth cause is a lack of marital aptitude. Most courses on marriage have something to say about the backgrounds of one's intended spouses, how to budget income, and work out differences. These are obvious but they still do not really take into consideration what I am trying to say. The lack of marital aptitude is the inability to enter into an intimate relationship where genital sexuality is not necessarily involved. Do you have the ability to enter into the deepest, intimate, emotional relationship with another human being if you do not have a genital relationship or contact in order to bring it off? (This is one of the most critical questions facing youth in our culture.) Can you really enter into an intimate relationship with someone where genital, sexual behavior is not present? There may be many who say no!

There is another side of the coin: the inability to have a meaningful relationship in which sexual intercourse can have its proper creative function. Many people in the man-woman relationship are no longer having sexual intercourse because they do not have a relationship in depth that this can foster and make meaningful. (Those of us who are in marriage counseling are finding that many people cohabit who are legally married but not genitally related because, genitally, there is no real function that is fulfilled by sexual intercourse.)

There is a cultural dimension also. We have been taught that sexual intercourse is for procreation. "After the children are born we are not supposed to have sexual intercourse any more." Others are absolutely convinced that after they pass a certain age they are not supposed to have sexual intercourse any more. Yet, in spite of all of these cultural factors, there is the tendency for some persons to enter into sexual genital behavior as an attempt to bring about personal intimacy. We live in a society that tends to be moving in a direction of "total permissiveness with affection."

In many marriages, there is no real dynamic, erotic dimension of human personality present. The function of sexual intercourse is reduced to the low. "Hurry up and let's get this thing over with." Then sexual intercourse becomes not only a disfunctional experience, but it results in persons becoming malfunctional.

I accent this aspect of marital inaptitude because of its tremendous influence in our culture. The so-called "sexual revolution" or "renaissance" of the twentieth century is playing havoc with all that we are about, regardless of where we stand. Furthermore, if you are a parent who believes one way, and your offspring believes another way, and you have to live together, that is even more exciting!!!

The sixth is external interference. External interference has been usually regarded as the in-law problem. Recently, one's occupation has been added as a critical factor. Now in a society that is moving more and more into leisure, it is "What I want to do, by myself, when I want to" that is becoming the external interference for some. It can be a hobby, one's occupation, one's married offspring, or a thousand and one different kinds of things.

I went out to Haight-Asbury in San Francisco last summer and--you might say--"lived with the hippies" for a brief time. But they would not say that--they would say, "We let this foreigner come in awhile." I discovered two identifiable things there: first, from the point of view of the male and the female, the male is to be free to do this thing--free to do whatever he wants to do. Second, the female, from both the male and female's points of view, is to take care of children or to be a mother of children, or both. We found females who had never had sexual intercourse who were taking care of three or four children in the communes. We talked to other females who had had three or four children, but who would not touch them. They would turn them over to other females to take care of them. However, there is a tendency to think that a female should just simply be a human being, a female type, and many of the other distinguishing characteristics such as "motherhood," disregarded. External interference is ideologically oriented as well as person oriented.

The seventh cause of marital failure is a trial approach to marriage. This gives me more concern than any of the others. I am convinced that no two people, at the time they enter the man-woman relationship in marriage, have anything in mind but that they are entering a relationship that they believe to be meaningful and that they hope will last. However, after they have entered the man-woman relationship, when the demands are greater, the impact of the cultural image which preceded the relationship and the lack of skills produce tremendous pressures in a great number of persons, an "O.K., let's quit" syndrome. Once they get into

the living relationship, they reflect upon many of the things they read, many of the movies they saw, many of the marriages they know about--maybe the one that gave them birth--and they know many of the various things that are going on in a community--including those behavior patterns described in John Updyke's novel, Couples. (This is a book that is labeled fiction, as many of the so-called sociological novels are about a typical suburban community in New England. The only thing that is fictional about it are the names. It is a kind of "educator's Peyton Place." Read the book if you want to get inside of many of the marriages that are representative of about 30 to 40% of our population. This is what it is like. The thing that comes through more and more is that of trial approach to marriage.)

Marriage without skills, parenthood without superskills (by default) reveal the basic nature of a trial approach. In summary, the causes of marital failure are multiple. The multiplicity of philosophies are constantly bombarding persons in marriage. Many have absolutely no base on which they can build. Coexistence is the result. "Do not get too involved because you do not have a chance to win." Not having been treated as a human being, they enter a relationship of "non-involvement." This leads to a failure to use differences and challenges for growth. The relationship is artificial. The problems of facing radical differences are too great.

Let us look at family life in the kind of political-economy we live in: what does family life look like? First, the impact of industrialization on marriage. Look at the obvious. A husband or wife's job takes him (her) away from home much of the time and absorbs his (her) major interest and energy, if he wishes to advance. The key word is "energy." Not necessarily the time away from one another, but the lack of energy to make time together significant. (I'm a traveler. I'm a traveler by choice and by type. But if I did not keep myself in the kind of physical and mental shape so that when I got back home I was anything more than washed out, I'd better change occupations. So when somebody says to me, "Why are you out talking about family life? You ought to be home with yours." I say, "That might be your problem but that is not mine.")

Studies have proved that mothers per se do not automatically affect family life negatively. Rather, it is what happens when they are together and the kinds of personalities that they are that affect family relationships. The wife who is not gainfully employed and since she is not directly related to her husband's occupation tends to stress family bonds--"Let's go home for Christmas," "Let's be sure the children get socialized." She emphasizes the status of the institutional family in the culture while the husband wants a wife who is a woman. And so, he comes home looking for a woman. Instead, he does not get one. In response, he gets deeper and deeper involved in the non-human,

depersonalized part of the culture, and the children flock more and more to guidance counselors!!

Second, the impact on parenthood. We have already said enough about the lack of skills. The mother tends to take over the entire care and direction of rearing the children. However, in the southern culture we still have a type of patriarchy. Our life style is as though we still live in a patriarchial culture. But in fact we do not, and yet our life style, from the point of view of the male, is that we do live in a patriarchy. From the standpoint of the female, we tend to live in a democracy--where she is the vice-president of the corporation (who kicked the male up to the presidency to get him out of the way).

The father is absent much of the time and facile contact and communication with the children usually is lacking. (However, I do not believe that there is a parent-and-their-offspring gap. I think there is adult-youth gap. Your experience may prove quite the contrary.) The traditional authority of the father stemmed from his leadership role in a common economic enterprise. Now he finds no way really of expressing his authority because no one sees his check; they just see him get prettied up each day and go off some place. He comes back later in the day and asks, "What have you been doing all day?" So to the children, his authority is not earned because he is a male, though he thinks it is; it is not because he has a particular job, though he thinks it is; it is because of something quite different.

The fact of the matter is that he does not have any authority as father. But how does the father earn authority? Hoe does he get authority? Well, one of the ways is to have the kind of energy that enables him to enter into a living relationship with the offspring rather than just look after the kinds of things he is called upon to do, such as "Is it all right to do this?" "What do you think about buying that?" If he only "approves" requests, he turns out to be a sugar-daddy, a push-over, no guts. If the American male continues to fail to be related to his children as a father, we may have to challenge his right to get married and have offspring. We probably should organize or try to prevent him from the "right of parenthood" if he refuses or is incapable of fulfilling his responsibility. We almost have a bounden duty to raise the question very strongly, "Does this particular married man have the right to be a parent in the light of his nature and situation?" Just making a deposit and running on about his business as in the pre-marital and pre-parental state leaves no place in American culture for that kind of breed. A major focus needs to be placed on birth control at this point along with the "population explosion." Does this particular man have the right to have any? If he has to find his basic identity by running around as an operator, busy for busy-ness sake all the time, involved in the great decisions of the world and of the universe, he

should not consider himself "house broken" enough to be a responsible father. (I put this just as graphically as I could because of much heart-ache I have shared with youth and parents.)

These are some of the issues in the light of what is happening in our industrialized culture, where the male's image of himself and the culture's image of him has never in history had much of an influence upon the father's role in parenthood. So, we have the gall and audacity to assume that the kind of mother-oriented, emotionally dependent syndrome in the personalities of our culture, who are expecting the federal government to do something for them, who are expecting the public school to do something for them, who expect "the foundation" to pay their way, anybody but those who really gave them birth--to assume the father's responsibilities. It is wholly unrealistic! Very little can be done until we get at least a part of the bio-sexuality back into the culture, where the male, who is the one making many of these decisions, takes his own responsibilities and breaks the neurotic, buck-passing cycle. It is going, and keeps going, around and around. Therefore, if I were in a public school I would demand that there be family education, in the most basic fundamental sort, from the time a child enters public school.

Third, the impact of industrialization upon family socialization. There is a lack of inter-generational continuity and support. Here again, the southern sub-culture has to be singled out. We are still living with the assumption that "who our parents were and the name in a particular locale" determines who we are and what it is all about. When we enter a public school room we can say, "Ah, this is the Williams family." Let us suppose the Brown family in a given neighborhood and for a generation in this community has been an outstanding family. Well, all a child has to do in a community like that is to show up, and he does not have a chance ever to be treated as a human being. He is treated like the image. In our southern culture, mobility is still at a minimum comparatively. The image of our families (especially, the outstanding ones) is a part of our psyche and a part of our general orientation. On the other hand, we are discovering that many of us in the South will absolutely fight if any organized agency or group tries to come in and do anything about parenthood or to anything about family life.

Those of you who work with family agencies are finding increasingly that in an affluent society private abortions are on the increase. Delinquency is on the rise. Non-marital pregnancies have increased many times. The so-called cultural gap gets wider and wider all the time. There is a lack of guidance from the older generation in child rearing. (I am the last one on earth who would ever want to turn the clock back, but there is something I would like to pull out of the historical past to contribute to my own household now. Permit me to

be quite personal at this point. We have two girls, and thank God we did not get a boy because I think I would have killed him before he had ever had a chance because of my innate competitive nature. But in our household we have a female who is 11 years old, who is almost exactly like I was, in temperament, when I was a child. "You couldn't tell him anything." She looks at me just as innocently and cooperatively as anything, and then goes on with just what she was doing. And she will say "yes." No trouble whatsoever. My parents must have figured out something when I was growing up, to deal with this type of personality behavior. I would like to have knowledge of the kinds of skills they used. What a tremendous asset this would be! But, often in our culture, one does not have that privilege. The family of orientation often negates the possibilities by telling their married offspring what they ought to do. Our teenage daughter is the opposite in temperament. She is so much like her mother. It is phenomenal how much I have come to understand my wife and to work through many of our particular relationships because my wife's parents helped me interpret much of her behavior--the dynamic and the temperament of our firstborn as a part of her life.) My point is this: we need the skills of a past generation, the dynamic of the current one, to produce a much stronger personality in the future. A tragedy in our industrialized society is the substitute of nuclear constellations of families for the extended family. The families of the 70's will have less continuity than the families now in our society because of mobility and other factors.

A study was done with youth in Texas which revealed many things--two of which I would like to mention. First, the most influential factor or person in their life was their parents. Second, the peer group is not the most dominant factor in formulating a value system.

Another significant factor that was discovered was, "We are not mad with our parents, but we know that we have not been taught by them the skills that we need to set up our own households." Now, note the significance of this point. The significance of this study was that the youth could say, "Parents are the dominant influence." They could also say, "We need more skills than they." This would lead us to be extremely optimistic. But the tragic thing, from the standpoint of a counselor, is that often your universe, the one you deal with, is only a percentage of a population. Often they are troubled people, or they are people who need some kind of a boost that is identifiable. But my judgment is, and I think there is enough substance to substantiate this judgment, it is tragic that we do not have an identifiable reference group or institution, including the religious, to help people unlock the potential that is within them as they bring families into being. We are doing so much "bandaid work" without much success. Our success story is almost nil. About the only thing we really do is to keep them up to "the 16-year-old compulsory attendance level," or

at least to keep middle-class relativism in the class, the school, and the system. But this is partly brought about because within the community of the schools there is not enough of that added dynamic of a family life education that has an accent on skills and that has an accent on real life potential.

For example, there are some people, and I am one of these, who believe that the need for youth to have skills, really acquired and developed, in how to live in a man-woman relationship in marriage and a parent-child relationship in marriage is greater than in terms of priorities of our nation than the poverty problem or the space program. We have tried to do about everything we know of with the tax dollar, with the volunteer agency, the community agency, and the public school. The bandaid operation is not working. Therefore, some other major thrust in our culture has to be made. Organized religion is beginning, at least generally, to move in this direction. But it gets hung up. Organized religion gets hung up with human sexuality in a way similar to the way the public school gets hung up with the tax dollar. From your perspective, you cannot function because "they" will not give you enough money or adequate status in the administration. You do not have qualified personnel now, so you can recruit some additional qualified personnel that really you need to carry out your task now and in the future. Not being able to get qualified personnel, or even get your profession up to a level where you can demand highly qualified people to enter it because of the absence of the tax dollar continues the frustration. "Our" problem is that we cannot really talk about the real issues in family life because the institutionalized church still is plagued by its historical heresies. The nature of the crises is cited by the fact that every study that we have done on families, and every study that we do with families' malfunctioning and personalities' malfunctioning are traced directly to some kind of a human sexuality belief or problem. No, I am not a Freudian, nor I did not say "sex drive." I said a human sexuality belief or problem. That is, human sexuality is so involved with morality and ethics that it consists primarily of some things we do and do not do. There are some things we do not ever do, regardless of what the situation is. You know the syndrome.

Let us say a further word about the sexual renaissance. I think the sexual renaissance is a better term than sexual revolution. By this, I mean that we have new patterns of belief and behavior coming into being that are not now identifiable. We can say two things with relative assurance. <u>One</u>, the primary function of the family in the American culture is to meet <u>affectional needs</u>. If affectional needs are not met, man's basic way of responding has tended historically to be in one of two: react through genitally-oriented behavior or in some kind of oral opiate such as alcohol or dope. We can expect in our culture that pre-marital intercourse will increasingly be a norm. These

changing norms are partly due to the inability of the family of orientation or the family of procreation to fulfill affectional needs. The underlying question is "Can I really know that I am loved and be able to love another?" Some who have experienced pre-marital coitus say, "At first, I thought it was real good, but then the more I did the more I found out that it does not fulfill the loneliness or equip me to love. If coitus is all there is, that is not enough!" This is a natural result when the family orientation fails to carry out its function.

There is pressure in our society toward a sexual ethic that may be stated thusly, "if I have affection for this person, anything is norm." (Just as, "if I don't have affection for this person, anything is norm." This usually means this--"I'll just slap the living daylights out of him." "And if I have no affection for you"--which means, you cannot do anything for me--"I have absolutely no responsibility for you.") This results in a type of pessimistic confusion which increases the generation gap. This gap demands that all of the agencies in our culture take a look at the confusion, its causes, and redesign its responses. We are so confused now that we do not have an option.

Another dimension of concern is the gap between the desire of some for a model and the essential need for each of us to develop as our own a particular style of life within the context of meaningful interpersonal relationships. I do not know a marriage on the face of the earth I would like to copy. And I do not know a husband or wife I would like to single out as a model. Why? Because 1969 is going to be so different from where we are now that I do not even know what a functioning marriage that year might look like. Any norm or model increasingly is disfunctional in the light of multiple and rapid change. Look for a norm that is constantly flexible and moving and that never has any more history to it than to clarify the field for dialogue. Rather than looking at the past and copying or perpetuating the past, look at the past only to get as much data as we can get together because the nature of the cybernetical age in which we are living. This means that marriage is going to be something that is so unlike what it was in the past, that it will make great demands on the skills for developing and maintaining intimacy. A basic question: How can I be so intimately related to another person that I have got the guts to make a decision where another's life is involved, even if it means getting fired from my job? If one has interpersonal intimacy, occupationally he will function different from how he will if he does not have it, especially in his occupation. Where there is intimacy there is security. Where there is a growing security, intimacy will always have to be fed by a new dynamic that was not previously present.

Another need in marriage and family life is to look at the structure of society, including public education as it now exists, and to see to

what extent these structures are destroying the man and woman relationship in marriage. Ask yourselves what role you have, for example, as a counselor, when a parent asks a child, "Why didn't you challenge the teacher?" And the child's response is, "Well, I did that one time, and I saw the results later on my report card." This is not to advocate disrespect, but it is to say that unless they can get into dialogue creatively with the public school teacher, the public school becomes a disintegrating factor. The public school to them is that teacher, that person, who checks them off, or who handles them indiscriminately when they are searching for meaningful interpersonal relationships.

Furthermore, another need in our culture is to achieve an individual sexual identity--that is, "Who am I, Ernest Stricklin, and how is the best way for Ernest Stricklin to be related and function within meaningful interpersonal relationships?" The degree to which I can identify myself, strengths and weaknesses, is the degree to which I am able to function in a relationship with other people. The degree to which I am not able to identify this self, this unique person I am, is the degree to which I look to somebody else to tell me what to do or how to act. Then, when demands are made upon me, without a personal identity, I do not have what is necessary for me to make much of a contribution to the relationship.

Finally, in the majority of marriages today, the accent primarily is on companionship, affection and adaptability. Research needs to be done to study the dynamic of the man-woman relationship in marriage which will broaden the possibilities which must be made available to the large number of people who will be entering marriage. It is predicted that there will be more people entering marriage during the decade of the 70's than have entered the relationship of marriage in our lifetime. Some of these will be doing it for the second or third time. Marriage skills are needed. They will be needed more than ever. Unless we can begin to search, all of us, it is not likely that we will have much to contribute. The best way, occupationally, I believe, that we might be able to do this, is to begin to struggle with our own sexual identity so that through what we do there will be manifested that kind of adaptability and that kind of affection that will take judgment out of what service we are trying to offer, especially with those who differ from us. When judgment is removed there will be unlimited opportunities to offer our services. In our unlimited services, we can begin to identify those areas where we can be relatively functional and helpful.

The future of the American family may be characterized as confused, rapidly changing and under great stress, but I am optimistic. Persons such as yourselves are becoming involved and concerned. There is an overwhelming challenge. This will demand a lot from all of us. It will demand something from everybody. Many will respond adequately. Others will be creatively innovative.

In conclusion, I believe that in the kind of political economy in which we now live, that we will either do this voluntarily by the existing agencies and institutions of society or the federal government will not stay out of some aspects of marriage and family life much longer. The disfunctionalism of many families in our society demands an answer to that disfunctionalism if our society is to grow and realize its full potential.

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS IN TODAY'S WORLD

Dr. Don R. Schulte, Clinical Director
The Sandhills Mental Health Center
Pinehurst, North Carolina

I am most pleased to be here and I am very grateful for the opportunity to meet with you. Dr. Stricklin is a very tough person to follow, but since we are both in the past affiliated in one way or another, with Louisville, Kentucky, I feel I'll have to take on the challenge. I had felt as if some of the material that I had decided to discuss regarding "Parent-Child Relations" tended to be quite pessimistic, but as I sat listening to Dr. Stricklin's talk, I realized that he was not painting a very cheerful picture either. One other comment, before I get started, Dr. Stricklin incorporated an elaborate summary in his closing remarks. I think that I will leave my comments open ended and will leave any attempt to summarize it as one of your tasks for the afternoon conferences.

In gathering together thoughts to be considered for this conference, I have attempted to focus on the goals as are outlined in the first paragraph of the program. The topic which was assigned to me was broad enough that I felt that I had a license to ramble along a variety of paths. One fact struck me and that was that I realized I did not know what the "roles and tasks" of the counselor are. This is the case despite the fact that a considerable amount of our work in a mental health center is involved with elementary and high school guidance counselors. I feel that in many cases the counselors themselves have widely divergent views of what their role and tasks actually are. This fuzzy concept of the counselor's role seems to extend upward to the principals and even to the superintendents in some cases. It extends downward to the student and also horizontally to fellow teachers. In our experience with counselors, the emphasis is frequently much more on guidance than on counseling. How a guidance counselor sees his own role is not always related to his training background. Many counselors seem to be quite comfortable as long as the focus with the student is on report cards, the SAT's, PSAT's, professional versus technical vocations, etc. As they move over into the area that I like to think of as counseling, even some of the best trained people shy away. I make these remarks primarily because the guidance counselors in school systems have long been identified as key resource people in the schools and a close working relationship between the guidance counselors and a mental health organization is almost mandatory if any type of school

preventive mental health program is going to be effective. Our effectiveness in working with various schools and school systems is directly in proportion to the insight, capabilities and motivation of the counselors in these particular settings.

On the afternoon of the day I was first contacted regarding this conference, I was out visiting one of the county public health departments talking with the public health nurses who work there. They had just finished an afternoon in the obstetrical clinic and as they came back from the clinic it was very apparent that they were not only tired, but that they were also discouraged and perplexed. The question that they seemed to be asking was, "What in the world is happening?" Perhaps to rephrase their question, they were asking, "What is happening in the world?" This question and the feelings of helplessness apparently had been prompted by the appearance of five new obstetrical patients all of whom were unmarried and all of whom were under 15 years of age. After we had discussed this at some length, it led to a more personal discussion about their own children. In particular they were talking about their high school age daughters who, in the last eight weeks, had informed their parents that they did not wish to go to the Junior-Senior prom. They did not want to go because the boys in the school had let it be known, quite loudly, that there was going to be much "drinking and carrying on" during and after the dance. The nurses recalled their own high school days and how they had looked forward to the Junior-Senior proms with much anticipation. They wondered, quite naturally, what had happened in the past fifteen or twenty years to change things so radically. I had to wonder why it has become so that a high school boy is so unsure of his own masculine identity that he must prove himself by drinking, fighting, and racing loud, super charged automobiles.

The following few days a series of experiences took place that run through my mind much like a kaleidoscope and take their place along with episodes with the public health nurses. They may seem unrelated, but for some reason, they all seem pertinent to the subject of Parent-Child Relations in a changing world. One of these experiences was listening to a newscaster relate the tale of the capture of the Pueblo. It was both depressing and discouraging at that time, but now, several months later, with nothing having been done about the incident, it seems even worse. The next episode that appears was that of a 16-year-old boy on his way to Dorothea Dix Hospital, after three unsuccessful suicide attempts. Another was watching television and seeing pictures of entire families calmly carrying their loot away from ransacked shops in Washington, D. C., stopping for a minute to smile and wave at the television cameras. A quiet, composed 12-year-old girl sitting in my office calmly telling me how much she hated her parents and that if I didn't send her away somewhere she would kill herself--she had tried unsuccessfully before. A tired, distraught school principal who spends

his time not running his school, but trying to straighten out desperate situations on his campus caused by vandalism, homosexual activities, runaways, etc. With such episodes, flashing through one's mind, with new but similar ones being added daily, who cannot but wonder what is going on? Who cannot but wonder where we are going and how all this will end?

There are few parents who can help but wonder as they look at their sons, what will be happening to them in the next few years. These can be very distressing thoughts. These can be very depressing thoughts. I wonder, sometimes, if the whole country isn't reacting to these kinds of thoughts. It certainly is not beyond the scope of the young children to wonder and experience feelings of futility and depression.

Frequently one will read in the papers or magazines a description of a deliquency and at the end of the article, the editor, with tongue in cheek, will indicate that this took place not yesterday, but 2,000 years ago and was written by Marcus Aurelius or was written the third century by St. Augustine or in the eighteenth century by Alexander Dumas. Does this then mean that these situations which are of such great concern to some of us are no different today than they have always been? Does it mean that these things took care of themselves in the past and that there is no need for concern? Does this mean that those of us who feel discouragement and helplessness about the current trends can be labeled alarmists or crepe hangers? I cannot answer these questions for any of you; for myself, I cannot help but feel immense concern when I read the papers and when I listen to people talk. I cannot help but feel that there is a change and that the trend of the change is not good. I cannot but wonder if today's children are not reacting to their own awareness of this change. A recent comment that I have read on this change appeared in a journal several days ago. This was written by A. S. Neal who directs the Summer Hill School in England. I would like to quote a paragraph from this article. He says:

> "The mystery is this, why is America becoming conscious that its education is not good enough? Why now and not twenty years ago? Surely, the schools have not changed all that much. But is it a case of change, of a change of society? Is society sicker than it was a couple of decades ago? I fancy that that is the reason. In all countries youth is rebelling. Alas, too often rebelling against all that does not matter. The hippies show their protests--not against war, not against race discrimination, not against the stupid learning we call education. No, all they challenge is the right to wear long hair and leather jackets and blue jeans. That impression I get in this country (England) but from what I

read and hear about America, the young, especially in the universities, are challenging real labels, the insane dollar values, the uniformity of the people who have been molded and indoctrinated so much that they are automatic slaves to any ideas thrown out by the press and TV screens."

Much, certainly, has been written through the years regarding the family and particularly regarding Parent-Child relationships. Especially the field of behavioral science has contributed to this vast accumulation of literature. Rather than review what has been written (and I feel Dr. Stricklin has done this quite well and thoroughly), I would like to share with you today some of my own thoughts and experiences, and in doing this I will speak primarily from the framework of the pathologic factors seen in the Parent-Child interaction which contributes to the emotional difficulties in the children.

I would like, first of all, to discuss at some length, a situation which is seen in our clinic with disconcerting frequency. It occurs in conjunction with psychiatric illness to such a degree that one must think quite seriously of a cause and effect mechanism being present.

One of the attractions of the field of behavioral science is that there is little monotony because every person is an individual and no two cases are exactly alike. However, after several months of seeing patients, I began to wonder if this really was true. It began to appear as if the only difference between some of the cases was the name. For example, after a woman sits down and describes her symptoms for a few minutes, one could guess with a high degree of accuracy that this woman either lived next door to her mother after getting married, or that she had moved into a trailer in mother's front yard. One could guess that she visited her mother at least once a day, but probably more often. That she did not get along well with her mother; that mother didn't like the way she raised her children; that mother criticized her all the time; that she felt as if she could never please her mother and on and on. Sooner or later, this woman would relate that she had a much closer relationship with her father than with her mother simply because she could at least talk with him. In a good percentage of the cases the closeness between the woman patient and her father would widen the gap between the patient and her mother and had taken on a strong competitive flavor between the two women for the attention of the father. When the conversation eventually would shift away from mother to husband, one, again, could with a high degree of accuracy guess that the husband would be viewed by the patient as overly solicitous of, and dependent upon, his own mother and that the patient felt that she was the second best woman in her husband's life. One could guess that the woman, sooner or later, would describe herself as

sexually cold and that she would probably describe her husband as being "after me all the time."

Basically, what is seen in the above described situations is that the identifications with parents of the same sex are by and large very unsatisfactory with a subsequent development of closeness and some form of identification with the parent of the opposite sex. Since a true maturation of a person depends to a great extent upon successful completion of the identification process, the people caught up in this type of situation very seldom become emotionally mature. Much of their adult life is spent in attempting to correct this pathological relationship with their parents. These attempts, by and large, are fruitless and frustrating and seem frequently to result in a variety of neurotic symptoms.

Perhaps one of the most distressing aspects of this whole picture is that it is possible to go back through several generations and find that a similar relationship between parents and children has existed on down the line as far as one can look. It seems to be a disease of repetition of bad situations and it is distressing when one thinks in terms of the future.

Frequently these relationships seem to appear in what are considered to be very close families. Talking in a negative way about close families is comparable to being critical of Santa Claus, motherhood and all the other good things. This topic brings to mind a young girl, one of the first patients I saw after coming to this area. Although she was just past twenty years of age, she had had many psychiatric hospitalizations and had been seen by many different doctors. She constantly talked about her family and on one occasion, I asked about the area in which she lived. In response she described a road less than a mile long on which there were about thirty houses. There was no one that lived in any of these houses that was not kin in one way or another to the patient. In discussing with this girl her various activities, it appeared that nothing ever was done that did not involve some member of this family. This close knit family situation struck me as being quite unusual and it is my feeling that it was in some way pertinent to the girl's psychiatric problems. After being in the area for perhaps a year, I soon became aware that this situation was not unusual at all; in fact, it was the rule rather than the exception. Among these people, questions like, "What do you do on Sunday?" would invariably bring the response "Go over and visit my mother." This visiting of mother usually involves all the patient's brothers and sisters. It seems to be a ritual that is motivated more by not wanting to make mother angry than by the thought of a delightful Sunday afternoon. Mother seems to be able to use the fear of feeling guilty very effectively for getting her own way with her children. Other facets of this type of family closeness are the fact that married couples seldom have friends outside of the

"clan." What leisure time is not spent visiting mother is spent visiting cousins. Husbands and wives seldom are able to go to the beach alone. They seem more comfortable in taking a pair of relatives along with them.

If, in the process of trying to treat a patient from this sort of background, one may possibly have an opportunity to talk with the family minister, he will describe the patient and his family as "good people," as pillars of the community, as good Christians, and as being very close to their family. I am sure that the preacher wonders why some one with these kinds of recommendations would ever need the services of a mental health clinic. The chances are, long before the patient ever got to the clinic he had advised them to "get right with God" and then there would be no problem.

Dr. Raymond Birdwhistle, several years ago, described this problem in a classic article in the Journal of Psychiatry. He did his original studies in a county in Kentucky in which there were two distinct cultural groups. He gives the name of Dry Ridge to one portion of the county and the name of Green Valley to the other part.

The Dry Ridge families are made up of parents and children and are labeled SEGMENTAL. In this settlement, one's siblings are members of one family until new domestic units are set up at which time the sibling becomes a relative. Relatives are people to whom one is more or less closely related. Associations with them vary on a basis other than degree of kinship. In the past, is the family in which one grew up, or for the child in which one's parents grew up. In the present, is the family in which one is growing up or in which one's children are growing up. In the future, are families in which one's children will raise children. In the future also are the remains of one's family.

Over in the other end of the same county, the Green Valley culture is described as INTERDEPENDENT. It is not a series of units through which one passes from birth to death, but it is a continuous inclusive growing system of mutual responsibilities and rights. When one's siblings, or even one's cousins, marry, the central unit is not reduced. If the marriage is, in family terms, "a good one," the relatives of the family member become one's own, almost like family. As these extend, as relatives meet at church, funerals and family gatherings, they gain kinship status, and are called that by all family members of whatever degree of relationship. These are all equally close for the interdependent. A child, for example, is more likely to build a close relationship with the offsprings of the mother's or father's closest kin associates.

Thus, while all the segmental family history is one of repetitive formations, budding of the subsidiary units, and the loss of the parental units; the interdependent family is one of dendritic growth and continuous reintegration of the extending branches with one another and with a variety of main trunks. The segmental family dies in the process of reproduction while the interdependent is rejuvenated by the process. The segmental individual must break away from his original family to gain independence and in doing so he establishes a unit which, as it successfully accomplishes its purposes, inevitably moves toward its own, and his death. It should be no surprise that the segmental sees maturity and independence as breaking away from his parents and that even as his child is born he must conceptualize the loss consequent to the maturation of this infant. The interdependent, on the other hand, seldom views maturity or independence as the state that involves breaking of fundamental Parent-Child or sibling ties. Loyalty is effuse and the Parent-Child break is crucial. At least a child cannot conceive of the parents being killed by the break. After all, the parent remains a member of the practially immortal system.

It seems as if we have been seeing many patients from families structured on the interdependent pattern. Perhaps it is this cultural entity that is contributing so lethally to the personality makeup of so many of the patients that are now seeing some type of relief from a myriad of emotional problems. These traits, at a superficial glance, would seem to be immaturity, physical and/or emotional dependency and faulty sexual identity. If such a relationship truly does exist, the problem of how to deal with it is of overwhelming magnitude. It is a problem that extends far beyond the realm and capabilities of the sociologist and the psychologist. It is a problem that challenges anyone who is perceptive enough to recognize it.

It will be well, at this point, to describe two broad groups of patients that are seen who typify in many ways the characterlogic defects that were listed above, that is, immaturity, dependency and poor sexual identification. In these two groups the defect is the same but there seems to be a difference in the way the problem is manifested clinically. The difference seems to be dictated in some respect by the social class of the family. We will use, for want of a better name, the terms lower class and middle class.

The lower-class are, by-in-large, blue collar workers, they can be in the mill, they can be on a farm, they can be just about anywhere. Income doesn't have a whole lot to do with it. These parents quarrel and fight frequently. This pattern along with the use of physical discipline for children enables these fathers to assert their superior physical power and become, by this technique, the dominant persons in the family power structure. They can, and do, support their position

by physical force, frequently beating their wives and their children. At the same time they have no interest in household affairs, and seldom take part in family activities. They are seen as physically powerful persons who are to be feared when they are home, but fortunately are away most of the time. When the fathers are home there is frequent and noisy quarreling between them and other family members. This pattern of noisy violence carries over to the mother's relationship with the children, and carries over into the children's relationship with each other. Children view these fathers as distant, stern and punishing persons. Most of the children have little positive emotional contact with them and seek substitutes in the form of teachers, policemen, clergy and doctors.

The mothers of these youngsters are involved largely in the routine mechanics of running households and maintaining some semblance of order. Usually they have larger families. They may have an average of around 4 or 5 children, while in the middle-class structure the average is about 3.5 children per family. Because of the household demands and attempts to maintain some semblance of order, there is little time to spend with individual children. The situation, of course, is magnified when the mother says, "I don't want to be a mother anyway," and goes to work. She decides she is so upset and so irritable that the children are better off when she is not there. So it's sort of "a sacrifice for the benefit of the children." When she goes to work she comes home and has the same duties, but less time in which to do them. Since the father plays such a small part in the family activities, the mother has much greater responsibility in making both minor and major decisions.

In these households where there are many children, the older children frequently have thrust upon them the responsibility for the care of younger brothers and sisters. The older children resent the responsibility imposed upon them and end up disliking their siblings who are under their care. Younger children, on the other hand, resent being under the control of a peer and are usually hostile toward the older brother and sister.

These parents display little positive feeling for their children and rarely are seen to express feelings of love. Rewards are given for good behavior and these rewards are usually material things, such as Cokes and Pepsi-Colas, ice cream and pennies. Even these rewards are inconsistent and extreme in terms of the behavior involved. Good behavior frequently goes unrewarded while expensive rewards are received for little reason other than the fact that the parent was in a good mood.

Punishment patterns are erratic and unpredictable. Frequently being expressed rapidly and physically. Since both rewards and

punishment are inconsistent, the children seldom know what to expect or how they are expected to perform. These children disrespect their parents and rebel, not only against them but also against all authority figures. By-and-large, this group comes to us usually under extreme pressure, from the school or pressure from the juvenile officer or courts. They don't come voluntarily. It's a miracle if we can get the father in at all; and the mother is so distraught, I think she'll go anywhere for help. (Even to a psychiatrist and that's usually the bottom of the barrel.) The mothers are concerned for their children, but are totally inadequate in coping with, not only the problems of the children, but the problems of a miserable marriage.

Probably a larger percentage of the two groups of people that we see the most of is the group we'll call middle-class. In here we get into, again, some of the areas that Dr. Stricklin was talking about earlier. The outstanding characteristic in this group is the emphasis placed on the equality of the sexes. This implies that powers are distributed according to abilities and personal characteristics rather than according to sex. While the literature describes the shift that we've seen in our culture from the traditionally patriarchal society to an equalitarian one, the clinical material that we see suggests that perhaps there has been an overshift. These mothers demand equal opportunities with their husbands in many social, occupational and educational areas, while at the same time wanting (and we'll put question marks here) to maintain their traditional role of wife and mother. In this atmosphere mothers often achieve a dominant position in the family power structure. Although the husbands are ultimate authority figures in name, in practice the wife often occupies this position.

The mothers in this group tend to be rigid perfectionists demanding compliance with their wishes. They are greatly concerned about their children's character and personality and supervise their activities very closely. Much of this interest seems related to mother's own frustrated ambitions for upward social mobility. They do everything possible to push their children ahead socially. The standards they set are often unreasonably high but this does not prevent most of them from prodding their children. Despite the strain, the majority of children strive hard to please their mothers because of the systems of rewards and punishments. When children are successful, their mothers shower them with affection. If they fail, most mothers withdraw their love or withhold their love. Under such a system the children are constantly under threat of losing their mother's love. We frequently see an inability on the part of the child to develop a sense of confidence or security, for no matter how hard they try they cannot satisfy their mother. These mothers, because they, by-and-large, do spend more time and are more concerned about their children, have a marked impact on the child's personality development. Despite the concern and attention

these mothers shower on their children, there is very frequently a gross lack of affection and demonstrativeness. It's, you know, difficult to sit talking with a mother and hear her talking about a youngster like something she bought at the grocery store. You know, if its grades aren't good, "it's bad"! If it doesn't say "thank you" when you do something nice for it--"it's bad"! Even in seeing the mother and the child together you see superficial concern and superficial patting on the top of the head, but it's unusual to see real warmth, either see it or feel it, going back and forth between the mother and the child.

In general, the home and children are mother's domain. Father participates little in the child-rearing process. He is considered primarily as the ultimate authority for discipline and punishment. Enforcing, much in the role of a policeman, laws which he does not make. In other words, father has no role in making the rules, but he is called upon to enforce them. Because of father's failure to play the expected leadership role, children eventually question the father's prestige and his authority. These fathers are seen as being dominated by the mother. The imagined punitive powers of the fathers are diminished by the fact that they are seldom carried out. They are constantly threatening the child with some type of punishment that very seldom is carried through. The children have difficulty respecting their father, and questions, not only his masculinity, but his role as head of the house. These feelings obviously, lead to identification problems for many of these youngsters. Even though they resent the mother's domination they have nowhere to go. They turn to Daddy, he fails them.

Tensions in this type of family are usually expressed verbally, rather than physically. The inference message that parents send to the children is that physical force is available if verbal methods fail in matters of discipline. This imagined conception of violence can lead to extreme feelings of destruction and castration representing, in reality, a more extreme threat or control than physical punishment, if it is actually applied in the matter itself. As you can see by this group, parental affection is a very powerful instrument of control. Kids seem to be quite aware of this, and we frequently will have them tell us, "Mother loves me as long as I bring home a good report card; if I don't, they pull back love." This is a sad state of affairs, when mother is more concerned about what a child does in school than she is about the child as a human being and her child.

I want to talk just briefly, if I may, about some of the differences we see between the boys and girls as they come into our place, boys and girls that come out of these environments that I have talked about.

The boys have intense emotional relationships with their mothers. Significantly more males than females are mother's favorites. They are

very dependent upon their mothers for affection and support. They develop their own emotional responses, very similar to their mothers. You can see the parents, then you see the kids. Nine times out of ten, you can identify the boy's behavior when you see the mother and the girl's behavior when you see the father. This is another of these things that may have a label that I'm not aware of. Let's call it "role confusion" or "role cross-over." As I say, they develop emotional responses similar to the mother's and they accept the mother's social values. If the mother is interested primarily in academic and social achievement and the father, for example, is interested in athletics, these boys usually will go to realms of academic and social achievement. There is a tremendously high price for this type of conformity, namely difficulty in developing appropriate socio-sexual roles. Sexual views are expressed from the mothers to the boys indirectly, if they are expressed at all. And, if they are expressed at all, they are usually from a negative standpoint.

In contrast, these boys have distant and hostile relationships with their fathers. Sometimes this hostility is masked as overt compliance or overt submission. The fathers are openly hostile and critical of these boys. They treat their daughters well, but this only increases the son's resentment. The father's behavior is often unpredictable, ranging from temper tantrums and rages to periods of quiet passivity. Fathers resent the attention the mothers give their sons, they are jealous, and this becomes so strongly obvious if you spend 30 minutes listening to them discuss the inter-action that goes on at home. These youngsters frequently are able to keep this anger and this resentment under the surface but usually by the time they reach adolescence it comes up bubbling. They may reject, as an expression of this hostility, father's social values or any of his values. If he wants a straight A student, then he'll get straight D's. If father likes baseball, the kid will hate baseball even though a couple of years ago he was very active and very enthusiastic about it.

The female patients by-and-large are a reverse of what we described for the male. They have poor relationships with mother, they squabble constantly, mothers are seen as tyrants, mother's authority is questioned and their orders are frequently disobeyed. Unfortunately, as the search for a suitable identification figure progresses and fails, these youngsters may slip back and ultimately identify with mother, even though there is a bad relationship between them. The guy they are going to marry will end up tolerating the same things the girl's father has tolerated. As you know, the relationship of these girls with their fathers is usually close. There is a wide range of closeness. The girls may actually assimilate masculine values and become active and aggressive in family and community activities. These are not, as a rule, good candidates for marriage.

As you can see, I'm not real happy about this situation. In my role . . . you know, when we see these kids, the youngsters may not be much of a problem to treat if we can cure both parents. Then you're really not curing--I use that word very loosely because I don't know how many people we cure. But to remake, to overhaul, to retread a parent is a big job. I don't know that anybody really does it, but we like to pretend sometimes that we do. But the thing that stands out terribly clear is that it would take a hundred times the number of professional people that we have, a hundred times the number of social workers and psychologists and psychiatrists, and any discipline that you can think of, to actually deal with the vast number of people that come through, like this. Granted, many of these never reach a clinic. I would guess that for each one that reaches a clinic, there are maybe ten on the outside that don't because this is so accepted that it has become the norm. This is so much, I guess, the American way. You know, a day will go by and you'll see three or four of these, and by the time you get home you're not only tired, but you're depressed and you're discouraged and you wonder where we're going and what are we going to do when we get there, and how are we going to get there?

THE FAMILY AND THE COUNSELOR

Reports of Small Group Work, Panel Discussion

Miss Kathryn Ray, State Supervisor
Guidance Services
North Carolina Department
of Public Instruction

Miss Ray: Let's start with Group One--Jim Mikkelson's group and their report.

Dr. Mikkelson: It was really a very good group except in one respect. That was their inability to volunteer themselves. Beyond that, there was real good participation, but nobody was going to be recorder until we got our points made. In the last few minutes we looked back and tried to arrive at what points we really had made in all the discussion, and we got about four. I think there were some others, but these were the only four we could really crystalize.

First, we had decided in contrast to the impression of the tone this morning, that by and large, counselors are a pretty optimistic group, and we do have a lot of conviction in the strength of any individual to grow and overcome his problems. This is the basis on which we really rest our counseling relationship, and we felt that we had to kind of reassure ourself of this, and that was our first point.

Secondly, we felt that we helped students by doing two things: one, by focusing on their strengths. That this is one of the things that we can help them with is making them aware of their strengths as one of the ways to help them overcome their problems and grow out of their difficulties.

Thirdly, we helped them--and this we clarified as part of our function--to help the student understand and establish his own values and to act on them. We wrestled with this for awhile, but concluded that this can, and often usually is somewhat different from the value of the family. Part of his (the student's) problem is deciding which things to incorporate as his own, and which things to reject, and which additional things to believe that the family doesn't. But, that usually there are some differences there. We felt that we have to recognize the need for that difference--that the responsibility rests with the individual,

and our purpose is to help them clarify them and understand them and live by his own standards.

A fourth point, we felt that often times it is by our very objectivity that we can do some of these things. Help the student to do this, to help the parents, to help the school as a member of it--to reflect things back into it. That it is true by maintaining our objectivity and our objective viewpoint of these things, we can facilitate in these kinds of development. Those are the four points we arrived at.

Miss Ray: These are very important points, and maybe after we have had all the reports, we may want to ask some more questions or those in the group here may want to say some further things among themselves. Let's hear Col. Murray's report.

Col. Murray: In Group Two we had a very effective group and a very effective group leader in that he was able to get a recorder to volunteer and a reporter to volunteer. Then his weakness is shown in that under pressure of his peers he was forced into service. So there seems to be some question whether parental influences or those of the peer group are the greater.

The group that we had was perhaps more diverse than most, inasmuch as we had a sociologist, who is not in the public schools, with us, and a welfare worker, who is not in the public schools, with us; and I'm in a private, technical school, so there were six public school counselors and the three I've described. We had, therefore, possibly, not entirely unanimous opinions, but they were majority opinions and they would confirm Group One's point that counselors probably are a more optimistic group than most: however, we did recognize the fact that--as our speakers earlier pointed out--their (the speakers') pessimism reflected the groups with whom they worked, and the groups with whom they worked perhaps are still a special strata that we don't see even in the public schools, and certainly in the public schools the persons that the counselor sees usually are not, certainly, representative of 100% of the total school population.

We did, I think, reach enough unanimity to say we had some conclusions. We certainly felt that the home was the prime determiner of the child; however, that parents could not be expected to assume all the blame. That the mass media and instant communications that we have today have got to assume responsibility for a certain amount of influence and, therefore, blame for the conduct of young people. This would suggest that perhaps there needs to be a re-look at journalistic ethics, possibly.

We do feel that perhaps some of the behavior that we call troublesome or think of as sources of our problems are not as vastly different

as that we experienced ourselves as youngsters, though it might be more destructive in nature. The degree, perhaps, is a little more extreme. But basically we and our parents shook ourselves loose on occasions too, and, of course, we pointed out that in our more rural society, in those days, it was easier to express our aggressive feelings than it is in the urban society, or more urban society, of today.

The population explosion, we felt, is something that is not to be overlooked. That, as was pointed out this morning, sooner than we can realize, perhaps, the problems that we have are going to become of such magnitude that perhaps the changes have already taken place and we don't know it. One of the things that we felt was the problem was that we are looking from, of course, our own predispositions, and that because of many things, instant communications, mass media, etc., our offspring, the young people whom we are concerned about, may not share our same prejudices or predispositions.

But in terms of optimism, we felt that history has shown that human beings can adjust and that when the pressure is great enough they usually do. We felt also that something very strongly to be said was that there are implications for education that perhaps are very much of an immediate need. When we talk about a school system that is oriented for 80% to 90% of the students to enter into the four-year standard, academic senior college in a society where perhaps only 10% of the jobs require that kind of preparation, something drastically is wrong. It was also pointed out that this wasn't a matter of how much education, but of what kind of education. Education is a continuing process, both formal and informal, and that we are not talking about necessarily terminal programs at a younger time in life, but in a wider variety of educational programs.

I would stand corrected if any member of our group would like to correct or amplify; otherwise, Madam Chairman, this is our report.

Miss Ray: Thank you, Col. Murray. The Third Group was Dr. Taff's Group, and I think he has a reporter here on the platform.

Dr. Pate: I won't destroy Dr. Taff's image as being an advocate of the non-directive approach by telling you the threat he used, but in any case I hope to present some of the questions that we wrestled with, and I think we had more questions than we had answers.

We started with the basic idea of trying to find implications of the two conference presentations for our work with boys and girls, or our work as counselors and educators, and throughout our discussion the word "communication" kept coming up. This seemed to be the key word in our discussion, and the first idea that we dealt with, and almost con-concluded, is that there is need for family life education, and certainly

there is a need for a liaison between the family and school. We got a little bogged down in the mechanics of it, in terms of what personnel we would use and what administrative structure might be appropriate, and we didn't arrive at a definite conclusion. But we were satisfied that there needs to be more of a liaison between the family and the school unit and particularly between the family and the school counselor.

We also wrestled with the question of what our role should be in relationship to those who are now parents. We had no doubt about what our roles should be in terms of our relationship to potential parents, our students, but we had some questions about our present willingness to undertake service in a very direct sense to present parents, other than it involves children we were working with. We felt unanimously that communication is vital and that schools must nurture the art of communication, particularly communication regarding feelings and emotion, and perhaps our present structure causes people to suppress any kind of communication about feeling or emotion, and that we should do the opposite--that we should encourage this kind of communication.

In dealing with some very practical actions that the counselor might take, we came up with these things, which are, in a sense, public relations or image building. We were concerned that we were left off the list of potential helpers that Dr. Schulte mentioned, and decided that this was a challenge to us to improve our image. In any case, we decided we must convey the idea that we have service to offer other than for direct specific problems. That we must be available for meeting the developmental tasks of children and normal developmental tasks. That the parents must be taught this so that they are not on the defensive when they come into the school to talk to the counselor or teacher. We felt particularly, owing to the difference in the school day and the work day, that some arrangement needs to be provided for parents to communicate with teachers and counselors without losing time from work. Perhaps providing an evening for conferences, so that we could encourage communication.

Then picking up from an idea that Dr. Schulte presented in terms of some person who respects the child, we all, as counselors, smiled at this and said, "This is the same thing that we call unconditional acceptance," and the same thing that we talk about as "relationship" and certainly the basis of a counseling relationship is respect. We considered training and how training might differ for counselors so that they could perform their job better, and we decided that here we need more training in discovering what the normal developmental tasks and problems of children are in the particular society and culture that they are growing up in, that we maybe have an idea of what the developmental tasks were, but we need to know what the developmental tasks are.

In consideration of the self-concept, and how we teach the self-concept, and the self-concept being a reflection of what others show to the child, we were forced to ask ourselves what we were reflecting and whether we were really reflecting to the child the kind of ideas that would teach a child to have a valuable self-concept--to have self-respect--and we felt that we were coming up short here. And as a general problem, as closing up specifically, we considered the idea of why counselors are not perceived as helpers, why they are not perceived as helpers by parents, students, and by administrators, and here again we came up with the idea that perhaps we don't communicate what we are trying to do, that we know what we are trying to do, but we fall down in the communication's art.

Miss Ray: That's comprehensive, isn't it? A very good report. All reports have certainly stimulated thinking. Now, let's see what transpired in the William Tucker Group, which is Group Four.

Mr. Tucker: There is one reassuring aspect of being reporter for a group such as this; I could easily say that what I was going to say has already been said. You wouldn't dare question it because it is so authoritative and so well-presented. Being as it may, I feel compelled to make a few comments. One of which, as we returned to the room I was informed by a delinquent group member that they were well aware of my views and ideas on everything, and I guess this is just saying to me that once again women are saying to the men that "we can read you like a book." Perhaps that being the case, I might ask the delinquent member to get up here and tell you what went on in our group. However, I hope it was a result of things other than some of my talk. Actually, it is a truism that what has been said previously were considerations of our group.

We, I think, sincerely accomplished our purpose in that at the conclusion of our hour we were very open-ended, we were very well aware of the fact that we had not the answers we would so well like to have. We concerned ourselves with such considerations as: "What responsibilities do counselors and public education have to the public in general? What can we do as public education people to improve communications?" And one aspect of improving the individual's conceptionalization of family living was pointed up by the question being asked, "What is such and such a system doing in the area of sex education?" This perhaps led us to one conclusion at the end of our meeting, and when I asked if we did have a conclusion, someone said, "Yes, we believe in sex and we don't think there's a substitute."

However, I think we would agree that perhaps as a result of the fact that public schools have evolved to the stage where they have become a dumping ground for responsibilities which other institutions,

perhaps the family being one, would not like to assume. One of these being the responsibility of sex education. Then we were confounded by the problem of "where do you begin?" Senior high is too late, as was evidenced by one of our counselor's comments, "The number of presentations of cigars he received this year from his students." Perhaps junior high may be too late, and it may very well be that attitudes and education in the area of sex education begin at a non-verbal level within the family prior to entrance in school.

One consideration which became apparent to me as we were talking about education's responsibility to the family and to assisting our young people in making adjustments to society was that if education does, in fact, have a responsibility, and if, in fact, our families are not presenting those role models we deem desirable, this may be an indication of a lack of the communication of education prior to this time. We didn't come up with the formula that we need to use in our schools today for informing our present youth and future parents as to how they might more appropriately present a desirable role model, but we did concede this to be a primary responsibility.

We concerned ourselves also with the thought that we must provide the liaison in a very active way with our present families if we are to bring our youth along to a point of view we feel desirable. And this would not be in such a manner that might be interpreted that we are going to give them advice or tell them that this is the way. We felt that merely involving a young person in a school day, allowing them to return to an environment which is familiar, which may be very comfortable, is not going to allow us to arrive at a point in our society that will eventually evolve into what we may consider a perfect model.

As I said, initially, I don't feel like we did arrive at any strong, concise conclusions as to how we will solve all these problems, but we do feel that public education has a responsibility, not only to the youth directly involved in various curricula, but also to the entire family, to assist in its unity, and as the Colonel has said, "I stand corrected by any member of the committee that would like to add to or modify what I have said."

Miss Ray: Thank you. Our next report is that of Group Five, and Mrs. Sarah Silverton was the group leader there.

Mrs. Silverton: I'm not going to give it. Dr. Barbara Winn is our reporter.

Dr. Winn: I was very passive so I got this job. We went over the ground here. We all gave each other therapy for about an hour and at the conclusion of which we came to more or less two main points.

There seems to be a lack of clarity of goals in the public school education program. Suggestions for this were a twelve year organized approach which would turn out persons, or human beings as somebody said, better able to handle themselves in adult life. And this is the chicken-egg thing; where are you going to start? But one of the group members mentioned her program which begins in the elementary grades, and this seems to be the place to pick up potential problems.

The second main point was that support for guidance programs needs to be more organized, and it needs to be allowed to extend itself a little bit, and this is urgently needed. There is more need for the personal, social type of counseling than there is for the vocational and educational type. Suggestions to help on this were that the counselor work for eleven out of the twelve months, rather than nine, and visit the families more. That family life curriculum courses somehow be put back into the school curriculum. Another possibility suggested was using group technique and under these group techniques a member mentioned a community group of people able to relate well to young people, and these were not necessarily professional but just community people who would gather together with problem students, talk to them, get the questions out that they needed a solution for, and then have an outside consultant come in and answer these questions.

The competition from the science side was felt to be a deterrent to expansion of the guidance programs, and the need was felt that the energy of the youth in the community needs to be channeled into more constructive activities. Several programs now in existence were mentioned, one of which took twelfth graders and had them helping in the mental health clinic in a community near by, and we felt that this not only helped these children but, in a specific way, helped them to have an individual to whom they could relate better. We also had some suggestions for next year's program but I don't think we'll...

Miss Ray: Well, why not?

Dr. Winn: Well, it was thought that the family emphasis was very interesting and that you should coordinate all the programs all over the state so that they could not come too close together and have the programs go on for three days rather than just one day.

Miss Ray: That's a good idea too even if it does sound like more work. Now, for Group Six--Dr. Smith's group.

Dr. Smith: Yes, now you have the example of the leader who couldn't insist that anyone else do this, so that's why I'm here. It seems that the position of Group Leader Six is very simple. Either I say too little, or too much, and I will probably do both. Much of what

we talked about has already been covered by some of these other groups, so I'd just like to hit some of the highlights. If my group members get mad with me, you can all meet outside afterward and hang me--I give you that permission right now.

First of all we looked at the question of what the future looks like and generally agreed, I think, that it's both frustrating as well as an exciting picture. I don't know whether we feel more frustration or more excitement, probably a mixture of both with one depending on what mood you're in at the particular time you talk about it. I think our group also agreed that the problems that were raised this morning, in a sense, were rather realistic rather than being either pessimistic or optimistic. This is the kind of world we're facing.

Also, we came to some understandings, I think, on the definitions of problems we were looking at--the fact that we've been in a "permissive-parent age," oh, up until some years ago, and then all of a sudden it's been turned over. The value systems that we live by and the value system by which our children live are somewhat different. The churches values, in a sense, have been upset also, in part torn to pieces.

Then we try to look at this "perfect-parent myth" considering whether or not we are dealing with this myth of people trying to be perfect parents. Then we decided about ten minutes later we'd throw that one out because we weren't really dealing with this. What we were dealing with was the problem of parent role. Also, we looked at the problem of incongruity between the parents and child, that is the fact that parents say one thing and then do something else. And the children sense this and then wonder what kind of parents they have.

Also we have seen basically some shifts in an affluent society which in many ways have created a vacuum for certain areas of children in particular. They can't work hard for money any more, you see, because the parents usually have enough money to give to them. In spite of the pockets of poverty we have in this country, we're still a pretty affluent society. And so what the children seem to do is to say, "I don't want money," you know, so they take off and join various groups like the Haight-Asbury group and so forth.

Then we look at the problem of how much has the school been assigned by default for what would ordinarily be taken care of in the family, and I'm glad sex education was mentioned because we didn't even talk about that one. We talked more about the problems of communication and how a parent can honestly communicate with children, admitting weaknesses and failures as well as strengths in what the parent can offer to the child.

Now, we raise the question of, well, how does the teacher-counselor communicate that they aren't perfect either and, of course, that really gets you into something of a bind when you have to admit, well, you're not perfect. But nevertheless we came to some conclusion that we should try to do this by various little acts, such as apologizing when we have been wrong, even in the classroom, to an extent taking the child into our confidence and trying to get the child to see that we weren't really so "holier than thou" after all.

Then we talked about limits, the relationship of limits to a child's growth and development, trying to get the child to respond in ways which were appropriate to the child's level of development, and not trying to get them to live by adult standards and tearing them all to pieces because they were not living by their adult standards. Helping children to admit to a certain extent the kind of feelings and identifying those feelings that they have, and then coming to some understandings and conclusions about various things about parents and adult roles.

Now, we raised a lot of questions right at the end, and, of course, that's a good time to raise questions because nobody has to answer them. Our first question was, for example, "What can the counselor give parents to make, or help them become better parents?" That's a real nice, interesting question, you know, and since we didn't have enough time we couldn't come up with an answer. Although we did agree that children need significant adult models after whom they can model themselves. If it isn't a parent, it's going to be somebody else.

We also talked in answer to that question about open and honest listening to children and trying to help them understand and communicate what they are really feeling. Doing constructive activities that both child and parent can enjoy together, rather than the parent having to go down to the child level and play the children's game, or the child having to come up to the adult level and play the adult game. The recognition of a very nice quality to have is patience, but we figured out that you could lose your temper once in a while and still punish a child, if only you recognize it is done in anger and can communicate this effectively to the child and that you might come around later on and probably should apologize for what you've done, or at least for being angry, maybe.

Then another question we raised right near the end is, "How do you counsel children when the problem is with the parent?" Well, the obvious answer is that if you can spend the time with the two, you really ought to, but many people just don't have that kind of time. So there I'll just leave that question up in the air and let you worry about it later.

Last but not least, we raised the question of, "What about family life education and what kind of a role can the school play in providing

certain forms of family life education?" What kind of cooperation should the school, as well as the parents and the community, seek in minding the communities' resources and providing some real fine family life education. We talked a lot about that near the end but didn't get much done with it, except arrive at the fact that something possibly could be done on a one-to-one basis, where a significant adult might have to go into the home and help the parent actually with their day-to-day situation with both children and the kind of tasks that they perform in the home.

I think our overall conclusion out of the group is that it has been a real interesting experience, and we were delighted to have had it. We don't have all the answers; in fact, we may not have any of the answers, but I think we enjoyed doing it.

Miss Ray: Well, now we have exchanged our various experiences through group inter-action, and I wonder if anyone on the other side of this table now would like to make some additional comments about things that were said in the group reports, maybe were not said in the group reports and should be added. Speak up.

Dr. Mikkelson: One point that I forgot to mention, but it was briefly touched on by somebody--he had concluded it was important--was this business of being able to establish and maintain intimate contact with other human beings. This was an extremely important thing. We thought it would be the base on which family patterns would rest and individual patterns would depend. We did recognize that value and felt, here is something the counselors can and do contribute to, both with the individual and trying to reflect the need for this kind of thing in the school, but we certainly had picked that out of the presentation this morning as an important aspect of human development and family life.

Dr. Winn: I think I would like to add to what we talked about. We talked about the fact that the speeches this morning were pessimistic on the whole, but we felt that they were this either/or end, and there is this great big norm in the middle that is perhaps the best group of all to work with, that if we can just learn how to channel these interests and energies, the optimists of the group, the world is not yet lost. And we can use these children and help them to grow to mature adults.

Col. Murray: I did overlook a point, Madam Chairman, that Dr. Smith alluded to, I believe, but it was made specifically in our group, to the effect that our traditional religious rituals and practices perhaps would benefit from some review and undergirding, particularly for the family and community who need something of new aspirations and new hope.

Miss Ray: That's significant, I feel. I think we would all recognize that young people today are probably the healthiest, as a group, that they have ever been. They are the most thoughtful, all in all, group of youngsters that we have ever seen, in the sense that they don't buy and we wanted them to be this way, and now we're a little shaken by what we find sometimes but they don't buy everything at face value. Many, many, many years ago, when I was young, I didn't question a lot of things. I just pretty well accepted something if someone older than I said it. But somewhere between that lost generation and the current youth something has been happening. They have been confronted with many things that we weren't. Reality is now coming into their homes when they are very young--television and newspapers bring it there. They can't remove themselves from these realities of life, so they participate, they get out and they are active, they are activists in many cases. Some go out and actually demonstrate. So we have an--I'm not going to say a product here, I think that is a terrible term to use--an excellent, vibrant young organism who can be very, very productive or who can be very, very confused.

We've pinned down a lot of things here today. I think that the real common thread through all the reports has been the optimistic view of this thing. Because, hopefully, we have often been told that we are people who are going to be responsible for getting some changes made, and I don't think change can be predicated upon pessimism. And, therefore, we can't let things stop at that point. We want to take an optimistic view and to build and to improve. I think that we have a role here, and it certainly has been pointed out to us. Education can't back off! The program of the school can't back off from some of the trends in society and say, "Oh, well, this is outside." We're here in the midst of it, and we're part of it, and will have, I hope, some influence in directing it.

I think that we have said to ourselves today that we have to know the school population and the community from which the students come. We can't just assume, for example, that every child comes from a home that has two happy, well-adjusted parents. The least we can do, I think, is to know the students in our schools who actually do come from homes with two parents and which students are living with one parent. This has some effect. How many of us could respond to that question with the facts? That's a big question, really: how much do we know about our students in this particular respect? And we talked about the effects of mass media, what role television has--how it's influencing our young people. In a way, it would be good if we could just push it aside a little bit; but it's going to continue, I would guess. That would be the probability I would bet on. I think we are maybe going to have more of it. In some circles it's called the "phantom curriculum." The newspapers--well, the publications business--is booming; and so students have access

to much information. Are we helping students to learn to evaluate what they see, what they read? Are we just not going to be involved when it's something that's going on outside of the realm of the counselor's major responsibility?

Another implication for the school is related to verbal communication. I think much of what we were saying today was that our students are affected by non-verbal communication from their parents. They're learning a lot from what they see and maybe reacting more or identifying more with what they see than with what they hear in many instances. Maybe some good verbal communication might help them to get some of this non-verbal communication into better focus. Maybe it wouldn't, but the question for us is, "How can we help young people to communicate better with another generation?" That's a real challenge. The communication gap is probably one of our great problems. Does the school have a role in this?

I like the idea about developing feelings of worth and the positive self-concept. Is all that done very early in life, and then we receive the "products" at school at age six and have no more responsibility in this? Suppose he, the child, just didn't happen to develop a positive self-concept? Suppose he brings us a negative one. He's going to be a parent one day. Well, there again, how do we build feelings of worth? How do we create situations in which these can develop? Creating liaison between the home and the school is the challenge, isn't it? How can we have access to parents? How can parents have access to us? Many of them work. We are essentially tied to a rigid school day. In the best interest of students, what is needed?

I'd like to say that the challenge to go on is the one that we must all look at, isn't it? Where do we go from here? This is a small group of guidance personnel in North Carolina. We have talked about the need for other pupil personnel services to be involved in this sort of thing. This has been an excellent thing, but is it enough? Will we make our real contribution to society if we were to stop with this and maybe go back home and do what we can without further planning and organizing? If the answer is "yes," I'd like to know; if "no" then I'd like to know that also.

I'd like to raise just a couple of other questions that came to my mind as the group reports were being made and we discussed situations in schools and attitudes towards school programs. I'd like to raise the question of what responsibility does the school have for the student who does not have access to a parent or to parents. I'd like to raise the question of what the school responsibility is in providing special services for students who are married? I'd like to ask this question and provoke soul-searching. Are we to assume some of the leadership needed

in this area? There was one additional question I'd like to ask; "In understanding and knowing our student body, are we really knowledgeable about the inter-action that exists between the boys and girls in our schools?" How many of us here today could say what the response of our students would be if they were asked about their views of their role as a spouse or parent? How many of us could say whether or not these students would list that being a parent or getting married is one of their most important goals in life?

APPENDIX

EVALUATION

OF

COUNSELORS' INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE

IMPLICATIONS ISOLATED
In Small Group Work In The
Counselors' Invitational Conference

Group I

1. Counselors were generally optimistic, with confidence in the individual to deal with his own problems, given some help.

2. The way to help students is to focus on their strengths.

3. It is important to help students clarify their own values, which are often different from the values of the family.

4. It is important to maintain an objective stance if you are to be of real help to individuals.

Group II

1. The home is the primary determiner of the child, though the parents cannot be expected to assume all the blame when things go wrong. The mass media, to name one factor, are an influence that must be taken into account.

2. The feelings of youth are different, not so much in quality as in degree, from those of their parents a generation ago.

3. Changes related to the population explosion are probably incommensurable.

4. History shows that under pressure human beings can be expected to make satisfactory adjustments, on the whole. The schools can help by giving more attention to what kind of education than how much.

Group III

1. There is need for more family life education in the schools, for more effective liaison between the family and the school, accomplished, for example, by means of evening conferences between counselors and parents. There is particular need for liaison between school and family counselors.

2. Schools must nurture the art of communication, especially communication regarding the feelings and emotions. The understanding that counselors are helpers needs more effective communication.

3. Counselors must help students with their developmental tasks.

4. Counselors need more training to help children with their developmental tasks and their problems, including their need to develop a satisfying self-concept.

Group IV

1. Sex education must be initiated on a non-verbal level in the preschool years.

2. A primary responsibility of the schools is to provide role models for family life.

3. Schools have responsibility not only to the individual student but to the family as a unit.

Group V

1. There is need to clarify the goals in the public schools program so as to facilitate the turning out of human beings better able to handle themselves in adult life.

2. There is more need for personal, social type of counseling than for the vocational-educational type. To facilitate the implementation of this concern, there is need to put back family life curriculum courses in the curriculum and to make more use of group techniques, especially those involving community groups who have good rapport with youth.

Group VI

1. Value systems have been upset, including the "perfect-parent" myth.

2. There is lack of effective communication between parents and the youth in their homes.

3. Affluence poses problems. One is the appearance of Haight-Asbury communities, whose inhabitants "don't need money."

4. There is need for honest parent-child communication.

5. There is need to let the child respond at his level of development.

6. Children need significant adult models.

7. There is need to discover constructive activities parents and children can do together.

8. There is need for family life education on a one-to-one basis, with the counselor going into the home to help parents with day-to-day situations.

Summary

1. There is promise in the possibility of channeling the interests and energies of youth in constructive ways.

2. There is need to review and undergird the traditional religious symbols and practices, to provide youth with needed aspirations and goals.

3. Reality in the home via TV breeds activities.

4. There is importance in the effect of non-verbal communication by parents in the home. There is corresponding need for help in closing the inter-generation gap between parents and children.

5. There is need for liaison between the home and school so as to help build feelings of worth in youth.

6. The problems of students with no parents or only one parent demand attention.

7. There is importance in the interaction between boys and girls in schools.

TEN IMPLICATIONS ISOLATED
In the Counselors' Invitational Conference

1. There is need for a counseling that, focusing on the individual student's own strengths, will help him clarify his own values.

2. The effects of the mass media need to be taken integrally into account in any assessment of the weight of the several factors in the development of personality.

3. There is evident need for a relationship between the school counselor and the home, with a one-to-one conference in the home being a possibility that merits exploration. There is particular need for contact between the school counselor and the family counselor.

4. The schools must nurture the art of communication, especially the communication of feelings and emotions. One way of doing this may be through the discovery of constructive activities that can be shared by parents and the children and youth in the home, that will engage the real interests and abilities of both.

5. There is relatively greater need for personal-social counseling, including counseling with respect to developmental tasks, than for the more usual vocational-educational counseling.

6. There is need for the initiation of sex education earlier, on a non-verbal level in the preschool years.

7. The schools have a primary responsibility to provide role models for family life.

8. There is need for particular attention to the needs of children and youth who live with no parents or only one parent.

9. There is need for attention to the effects of interaction between the two sexes in the schools.

10. Youth need worthy goals, of the sort that traditional religious symbols and practices have provided. Can the schools make a contribution in this area?

CORRELATION BETWEEN "Ten Implications of
Counselors' Invitational Conference and Conferees
Answers to the Question,
"What Kind of Conference (in follow up) Would Be Most Helpful To You?"

Implication 2: The effects of the mass media need to be taken integrally into account in any assessment of the weight of the several factors in the development of personality.

Response 11: Influences on youth are considered other than the family.

Implication 3: There is evident need for a relationship between the school counselor and the home, with a one-to-one conference in the home being a possibility that merits exploration. There is particular need for contact between the school counselor and the family counselor.

Response 6: How can counselors work most effectively with parents who cause their children to have severe emotional problems of adjustment?

Response 15: The relation of counselor to parents, resource people, etc.

Response 16: The solving of problems of the family.

Response 18: How to work with parents who need help in understanding their teenagers and meeting their needs.

Response 19c: What can we do for parent education to our work and their children's developmental problems?

Response 22: Communication between family and counselor.

Implication 4: The schools must nurture the art of communication, especially of feelings and emotions...

Response 9: How to improve school-parent-counselor relationships?

Response 10: Focus on communications and relationships.

Response 14: Personal-social activities of students.

Response 19b: How can parent-school communications be improved?

Response 22: Communication between family and counselor.

Implication 5: There is...need for personal-social counseling...

Response 12: Present-day problems--mental health, dropouts, needed curriculum changes.

Response 14: Personal-social activities for students.

Response 20: The counselor and the world of work. (The thrust of this response is probably different from that of the others.)

Implication 6: There is need for the initiation of sex education earlier, on a non-verbal level in the preschool years.

Response 7: Family life education in the schools.

Response 8: Workshop involving methods of sex education in the schools.

Response 19a: Elementary school counseling and its need.

Implication 8: There is need for particular attention to the needs of children and youth who live with no parents or only one parent.

Response 5: Similar one--more emphasis, however, on the one-parent family.

OTHER RESPONSES

1. Concerning resources

Response 4: Similar to this one, with outside resource persons looking with us at one problem.

Response 13: Discussion of useful work being done in the school systems of North Carolina, both rural and urban.

Response 15: The relation of counselor to...resource people.

Response 17: Community resources available to counselors.

2. Concerning group counseling

Response 21: Group counseling.

Possibly Response 18: How to work with parents who need help in understanding their teenagers and meeting their needs.

Evaluation Sheet

1. The purpose of this conference was "to provide...in a changing world." In your experience how well was this purpose achieved?

   _____ very well
   _____ quite well
   _____ satisfactory
   _____ not too well
   _____ not at all

2. Please rank the following factors, from 1 (the highest) to 4 (the lowest), in order of their importance for the achieving of the stated purpose.

FACTOR	RANK
Panel	_____
Small Work Group	_____
"Parent-Child Relations in Today's World"	_____
"The Changing Family in Today's World"	_____

3. How would you grade each of the following factors? Please circle the appropriate letter.

FACTOR	GRADE				
Panel	A	B	C	D	E
Small Work Group	A	B	C	D	E
"Parent-Child Relations in Today's World"	A	B	C	D	E
"The Changing Family in Today's World	A	B	C	D	E
The schedule	A	B	C	D	E
The place of meeting	A	B	C	D	E
Other _____	A	B	C	D	E

4. Would you be interested in a follow-up conference?

   _____ yes
   _____ no
   _____ not sure at this time

5. If so, when would be a good time for you?

_____ Fall, 1968
_____ Spring, 1969
_____ Other _____
(please specify)

6. What kind of conference would be most helpful to you?

7. Any comments?

Signed _____